

1 Robert A. Weikert (Bar No. 121146)
rweikert@nixonpeabody.com
2 Dawn N. Valentine (Bar No. 206486)
dvalentine@nixonpeabody.com
3 NIXON PEABODY LLP
4 One Embarcadero Center
5 San Francisco, California 94111-3600
Tel: (415) 984-8200
Fax: (415) 984-8300

6 David L. May (appearance *pro hac vice*)
dmay@nixonpeabody.com

7 Jennette E. Wiser (appearance *pro hac vice*)
jwiser@nixonpeabody.com

8 NIXON PEABODY LLP
799 9th Street NW
9 Washington, DC 20001-4501
10 Tel: (202) 585-8000
Fax: (202) 585-8080

11 Jason T. Kunze (appearance *pro hac vice*)
jkunze@nixonpeabody.com

12 NIXON PEABODY LLP
13 70 West Madison Street, 35th Floor
14 Chicago, IL 60602
15 Tel: (312) 977-4400
16 Fax: (312) 977-4405

15 || Attorneys for Stardock Systems, Inc.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION**

19 | STARDOCK SYSTEMS, INC..

Case No.: 4:17-cv-07025-SBA

20 Plaintiff.

**PLAINTIFF'S EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS
TO THE DECLARATION OF REICHE IN
SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION
TO STARDOCK'S MOTION FOR
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION SHOULD NOT
BE GRANTED**

Defendants

Judge: Hon. Saundra B. Armstrong

Complaint Filed: Dec. 8, 2017
Trial Date: June 24, 2019

28 EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS TO THE DECLARATION OF REICHE ISO DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO
STARDOCK'S MOTION FOR TRO AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY PI SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED

Case No. 17-cv-07025-SBA

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIM
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Plaintiff Stardock Systems, Inc. (“Plaintiff” or “Stardock”) hereby submits the following objections to the Declaration of Paul Reiche III (“Reiche Declaration”) in Support of Paul Reiche III’s (“Reiche”) and Robert Frederick Ford’s (“Ford”) (collectively, “Defendants”) Opposition to Stardock Systems, Inc.’s *Ex Parte* Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Order to Show Cause Why Preliminary Injunction Should Not Be Granted (“Defendants’ Opposition”). The Reiche Declaration is objectionable for a variety of reasons, and should be disregarded in its entirety or given little or no weight in the determination of Stardock’s Motion.

	Objectionable Evidence	Grounds for Objection
1.	<p>“In the Summer of 1988, I created the concept for the Star Control computer game and made a proposal to develop it to multiple video game publishing companies, including Accolade.”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 2, ¶ 2, lines 5-7</p>	<p><u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement that he “created the concept for the Star Control computer game,” or that he made development proposals to “multiple video game publishing companies.”</p> <p><u>FRE 1002</u> Furthermore, the declarant has failed to include the proposal documents required by the “best evidence” rule to prove that these development proposals took place.</p>
2.	<p>“This mode of gameplay was unique when we created and released <i>Star Control</i>, as far as I recall.”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 2, ¶ 5, lines 27-28</p>	<p><u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement that the mode of gameplay was unique at the time <i>Star Control</i> was created.</p> <p><u>FRE 602</u> <u>Speculation</u> The declarant lacks personal knowledge</p>

	Objectionable Evidence	Grounds for Objection
		and is speculating as to whether any other games had similar modes of gameplay at the time <i>Star Control</i> was released.
3.	<p>“Each of the alien species has a unique name, appearance, ship(s), weapons, backstory, and conversational style.”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 3, ¶ 7, lines 7-8</p>	<u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement.
4.	<p>“As far as I know, no other game had a screen display, layout, and functionality like this before, or since (except for Stardock’s <i>Origins</i> beta initially called “Super Melee” and then “Fleet Battles” as discussed below.”)</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 4, ¶ 9, lines 12-14</p>	<u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement. <u>FRE 602</u> <u>Speculation</u> The declarant lacks personal knowledge and is speculating as to whether any other games had similar screen display, layout, and functionality similar to <i>Star Control</i> .
5.	<p>“Fred and I were the primary authors of most of the creative materials incorporated into both <i>Star Control I and II</i>, including the game design, story, art, sound effects, software code, and other materials.”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 4, ¶ 11, lines 17-19</p>	<u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement.
6.	<p>“. . . I personally created the names, initial concepts, written descriptions, and sketches of every character in the games, as well as their history, physical and cultural details, and conversation design and text specifications. I also wrote a majority of the dialogue for the characters, and illustrated a majority of the ships, among other things.”</p>	<u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement that he actually created any of the elements contained in this statement.

Objectionable Evidence		Grounds for Objection
Reiche Decl., p. 4, ¶ 12, lines 20-24		
7.	<p>“In addition to co-leading the development of the games with me and acting as one of the producers, Fred personally wrote all of the code for both <i>Star Control I and II</i>, as far as we can recall.”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 4, ¶ 13, lines 25-27</p>	<p><u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement.</p> <p><u>Speculation</u> The declarant is speculating as to the role that Fred had in the development of Star Control I and II, as evidenced by the statement “as far as we can recall.”</p>
8.	<p>“To the best of my recollection, everyone who contributed creative content to the games agreed to assign any copyrights to their material to Fred and me at that time, and have since signed written agreements confirming this.”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 5, ¶ 14, lines 4-6</p>	<p><u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement that other individuals who worked on the Star Control computer game agreed to assign their copyrights.</p> <p><u>Speculation</u> The declarant is speculating as to whether other contributors in the development of Star Control I and II agreed to assign copyrights to Fred and the declarant, as evidenced by the statement “[t]o the best of my recollection . . .”</p> <p><u>FRE 1002</u> Furthermore, the declarant has failed to include the assignment documents required by the “best evidence” rule to prove that these assignments actually took place.</p>
9.	“Thus, aside from a small amount of music in <i>Star Control II</i> which we licensed, all copyrights to <i>Star Control I and II</i> are and have always been owned by Fred and me.”	<p><u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 701</u> The declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, as he does not have the expertise necessary to provide opinion as to whether he owns “all copyrights to</p>

	Objectionable Evidence	Grounds for Objection
	Reiche Decl., p. 5, ¶ 15, lines 7-8	<p><i>Star Control I and II.</i>" As a result, his opinions constitute improper lay witness testimony that encompasses technical and/or specialized knowledge exclusively within the scope of FRE 702.</p> <p>FRE 1002 Furthermore, the declarant has failed to include the copyright ownership documents required by the "best evidence" rule to prove ownership.</p>
10.	<p>"Fred and I later obtained U.S. Copyright Registration No. PA 2-071-496 for the work titled 'Star Control II,' which covers all computer program code for that game, and U.S. Copyright Registration No. PA 2-107-340 for the work titled 'Star Control II,' which covers all of the audiovisual and written content in the game . . ."</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 5, ¶ 19, lines 21-24</p>	<p>FRE 602 FRE 701 The declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, as he does not have the expertise necessary to provide opinion as to what the alleged copyrights do or do not cover. As a result, his opinions constitute improper lay witness testimony that encompasses technical and/or specialized knowledge exclusively within the scope of FRE 702.</p>
11.	<p><i>"Star Control 3</i> was not as well-received as <i>Star Control I and II.</i>"</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 6, ¶ 20, lines 6-7</p>	<p>FRE 602 The declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement.</p> <p>FRE 901 The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement that <i>Star Control 3</i> was not as well-received as <i>Star Control I and II.</i></p>
12.	<p>"Accolade offered to purchase all rights to <i>Star Control I and II</i> and any other <i>Star Control</i> products from me. Accolade acknowledged that Fred and I created and owned <i>Star Control</i>, including 'its themes, settings, plot lines, characters, its 'essence' as entity unique from any other science-fiction game,' and that <i>Star</i></p>	<p>FRE 901 The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement that Accolade offered to purchase rights to <i>Star Control</i>, and that it acknowledged that the declarant was the owner of those rights.</p>

	Objectionable Evidence	Grounds for Objection
	<p><i>Control 3</i> was created only with Fred's and my permission under agreements with Accolade."</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 6, ¶ 22, lines 11-15</p>	<p><u>FRE 801, 802</u> Furthermore, the statements allegedly made by Accolade are extrajudicial statements being offered for their truth, and as such they are inadmissible hearsay without exception.</p> <p><u>FRE 1002</u> Finally, the declarant has failed to include the documents required by the "best evidence" rule to prove that Accolade did indeed make an offer to purchase any rights to the Star Control games.</p>
13.	<p>"In November 1997, Accolade asked instead for a perpetual exclusive license to the classic background material for <i>Star Control I and II</i> for use in a new Star Control game and potential future sequels. Accolade stated that '[c]urrently, Accolade owns the rights to the title Star Control, and [Reiche and Ford] own the rights to the classic background material created for Star Control and Star Control 2,' and that '[Accolade] would like to unify the Star Control license . . .'"</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 6, ¶ 23, lines 17-22</p>	<p><u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement that Accolade wanted a perpetual license, and that it acknowledged that the declarant was the owner of those rights.</p> <p><u>FRE 801, 802</u> Furthermore, the statements allegedly made by Accolade are extrajudicial statements being offered for their truth, and as such they are inadmissible hearsay without exception.</p> <p><u>FRE 1002</u> Finally, the declarant has failed to include the documents required by the "best evidence" rule to prove that Accolade did indeed make an offer to purchase an exclusive license to the Star Control games.</p>
14.	<p>Accolade never paid me any advances or royalties under Addendum No. 3 after the initial advance in 1998 . . . Accolade also stopped paying royalties for sales of the</p>	<p><u>FRE 901</u> <u>Speculation</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement that Accolade did not make</p>

1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27
1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27
	<p>Classic Star Control Games after 2000 at the latest, indicating that it had stopped selling them. "Thus, the 1988 License Agreement and Addenda Nos. 1-3 expired and terminated by April 1, 2001, and all copyrights to <i>Star Control I and II</i> and our materials used in <i>Star Control 3</i> reverted to Fred and me on or about April 1, 2001.</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 7, ¶ 27, lines 6-11</p>	<p>advances after 1998 or pay royalties after 2000, and is speculating as to whether Accolade did indeed stop selling Classic Star Control Games after 2000.</p> <p><u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 701</u></p> <p>The declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, as he does not have the expertise necessary to provide opinion as to when the License Agreement terminated, and whether "all copyrights to <i>Star Control I and II</i> and [the] materials used in <i>Star Control 3</i>" reverted to the declarant on or about April 1, 2001. As a result, his opinions constitute improper lay witness testimony that encompasses technical and/or specialized knowledge exclusively within the scope of FRE 702.</p>
15.	<p>"... Accolade indicated that it was no longer using the name and had no plans to do so in the future."</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 7, ¶ 28, lines 15-16</p>	<p><u>FRE 901</u></p> <p>The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement that Accolade no longer intended to use the Star Control mark.</p> <p><u>FRE 801, 802</u></p> <p>Furthermore, the statements allegedly made by Accolade are extrajudicial statements being offered for their truth, and as such they are inadmissible hearsay without exception.</p>
16.	<p>On or about April 1, 2011, Fred and I learned that a company called Good Old Games was selling <i>Star Control I and II</i> on its website, GOG.com . . . without our permission and in violation of our copyrights.</p> <p>Reiche Decl., ¶ 32, p. 7 lines 27-28 top.</p>	<p><u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 701</u></p> <p>The declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, as he does not have the expertise necessary to provide opinion as to whether Good Old Games was violating any copyrights. As a result, his opinions constitute improper lay witness</p>

	Objectionable Evidence	Grounds for Objection
	8 line 1	testimony that encompasses technical and/or specialized knowledge exclusively within the scope of FRE 702.
17.	<p>“On April 22, 2011, Fred and I notified Atari and GOG that we were the authors and owners of <i>Star Control I and II</i> and had not given permission for Atari to sell them. We reminded Atari that while Accolade once held the publishing rights, such rights expired long ago and that any purported agreement by Atari concerning our work violated our rights.”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p.8, ¶ 33, lines 4-8</p>	<u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 701</u> The declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, as he does not have the expertise necessary to provide opinion as to whether he owned <i>Star Control I and II</i> , whether Accolade’s publishing rights had expired, and whether Atari had the right to sell any of the <i>Star Control</i> games. As a result, his opinions constitute improper lay witness testimony that encompasses technical and/or specialized knowledge exclusively within the scope of FRE 702.
18.	<p>“On January 2, 2012, we entered into an agreement with GOG to provide it with a non-exclusive license to distribute the Classic <i>Star Control</i> Games . . .”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 8, ¶ 37, lines 19-21</p>	<u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement that he agreed to a non-exclusive license with GOG to distribute the Classic <i>Star Control</i> Games. <u>FRE 1002</u> Additionally, the declarant has failed to include the documents required by the “best evidence” rule to prove that the alleged non-exclusive license took place.
19.	<p>“I understand that around January 2013, Atari filed for bankruptcy and put its assets up for auction, including the “Star Control Franchise” consisting of some rights to “Star Control 3” but no rights to the <i>Star Control I and II</i> games that Fred and I create and for which we own the copyrights.”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 8, ¶ 38, lines 23-26</p>	<u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 701</u> The declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, as he does not have the expertise necessary to provide opinion as to what rights may or may not have been included in Atari’s bankruptcy, and whether or not the declarant owns any relevant copyrights. As a result, his opinions constitute improper lay witness testimony that encompasses technical

	Objectionable Evidence	Grounds for Objection
		<p>and/or specialized knowledge exclusively within the scope of FRE 702.</p> <p><u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement.</p> <p><u>Speculation</u> The declarant is speculating as to the details of Atari's bankruptcy, as evidenced by the statement "I understand that around January 2013 . . ."</p>
20.	<p>"U.S. Copyright Registration No. PA 799-000 for Star Control 3 . . . could not have included rights to 'characters, names, likenesses, characteristics, and other intellectual property rights pertaining to Star Control I and Star Control II in which Reiche has an ownership interest' that we licensed to Accolade under Addendum No. 2 to the 1988 License Agreement."</p> <p>Reiche Decl., ¶ 39, p. 8 lines 27-28 top. 9 lines 1-4.</p>	<p><u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 701</u> The declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, as he does not have the expertise necessary to provide opinion as to what a copyright registration may include, and whether or not the declarant owns any relevant copyrights. As a result, his opinions constitute improper lay witness testimony that encompasses technical and/or specialized knowledge exclusively within the scope of FRE 702.</p> <p><u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement.</p>
21.	<p>"Stardock now claims it also bought exclusive publishing rights to Fred's and my <i>Star Control I and II</i> games under the 1988 License Agreement. This is not possible for at least three reasons. First, the 1988 License Agreement expired by 2001, when Accolade ceased selling the games and paying royalties to me. Second, even if it had not expired in 2001, under the 1988 License Agreement,</p>	<p><u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 701</u> The declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, as he does not have the expertise necessary to provide opinion as to the transfer of publishing rights as a result of Atari's bankruptcy, whether or not the declarant owns any of the relevant copyrights, and as to whether the 1988 License Agreement could be</p>

	Objectionable Evidence	Grounds for Objection
	<p>all rights to our games would have reverted to me when the Atari bankruptcy took more than 90 days to be terminated. Third, the 1988 License Agreement could not be assigned without my consent, and Atari and Stardock never asked for nor received such consent from me.”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 9, ¶ 40, lines 5-12</p>	<p>assigned without his consent. As a result, his opinions constitute improper lay witness testimony that encompasses technical and/or specialized knowledge exclusively within the scope of FRE 702.</p> <p><u>FRE 901</u></p> <p>The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement.</p>
22.	<p>“Fred and I hold the copyrights to Star Control I and II personally . . . We also hold the use of those copyrights in Star Control II, but do not have any ownership of the new material in that product.”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 10, ¶ 43, lines 2-4</p>	<p><u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 701</u></p> <p>The declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, as he does not have the expertise necessary to provide opinion as to copyright ownership. As a result, his opinions constitute improper lay witness testimony that encompasses technical and/or specialized knowledge exclusively within the scope of FRE 702</p>
23.	<p>“Wardell admitted that ‘Atari doesn’t actually own the copyright on Star Control 1/2 so it’s not like one could make a Star Control 2 HD or what have you without a license from Paul Reiche.’”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 10, ¶ 44, lines 7-9</p>	<p><u>FRE 901</u></p> <p>The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement, nor even identified the source of this alleged statement.</p> <p><u>FRE 106</u></p> <p>Furthermore, this isolated statement is only a portion of a larger conversation that the declarant should have included to provide necessary context.</p>
24.	<p>Seemingly in response to Fred’s and my announcement and refusal to license our content . . . Stardock began selling the Classic Star Control Games through Steam . . . without permission from us and in violation of our copyrights.</p>	<p><u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 701</u></p> <p>The declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, as he does not have the expertise necessary to provide opinion as to the transfer of publishing rights as a</p>

	Objectionable Evidence	Grounds for Objection
	Reiche Decl., p. 12, ¶ 63, lines 19-24	<p>result of Atari's bankruptcy, whether or not the declarant owns any of the relevant copyrights, and as to whether the 1988 License Agreement could be assigned without his consent. As a result, his opinions constitute improper lay witness testimony that encompasses technical and/or specialized knowledge exclusively within the scope of FRE 702.</p> <p><u>Speculation</u> Furthermore, the declarant is speculating as to Stardock's intentions behind selling the Classic Star Control Games through steam.</p> <p><u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement or authenticate the alleged screenshot of Stardock's website.</p>
25.	<p>“In late 2017, Fred and I sent Valve a DMCA notice notifying them of our copyrights . . .”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 13, ¶ 64, lines 19-20</p>	<p><u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 701</u> The declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, as he does not have the expertise necessary to provide opinion as to whether or not the declarant owns any of the relevant copyrights. As a result, his opinions constitute improper lay witness testimony that encompasses technical and/or specialized knowledge exclusively within the scope of FRE 702.</p> <p><u>FRE 1002</u> Additionally, the declarant has failed to include the documents required by the “best evidence” rule to demonstrate the date and content of the Valve DMCA.</p>

1	2 Objectionable Evidence	3 Grounds for Objection
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	26. "Last fall, Stardock also began taking preorders for its forthcoming <i>Origins</i> game . . . and began releasing information about the game that suggests it will infringe our copyrights to the <i>Star Control I and II</i> games." Reiche Decl., p. 13, ¶ 65, lines 23-25	<u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 701</u> The declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, as he does not have the expertise necessary to provide opinion as to whether Stardock's game will infringe any copyrights. As a result, his opinions constitute improper lay witness testimony that encompasses technical and/or specialized knowledge exclusively within the scope of FRE 702. <u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement or authenticate the alleged screenshot of Stardock's website.
13 14 15	27. "From the publicly released videos . . ." Reiche Decl., p. 14, ¶ 66, line 3	<u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement, or even identified the videos to which he is referring.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	28. "On May 11, 2018, Wardell stated on Stardock's website that contrary to his prior statements, "[f]uture Star Control games will have the classic Star Control aliens in them . . . Only the most unreasonable person would argue that Star [] control games can't have Star Control aliens simply because an independent contractor of Accolade's claims rights to names he may or may not of [sic?] randomly generated 28 years ago. A screenshot of Stardock's online forum containing this statement is attached as Exhibit 13." Reiche Decl., p. 14, ¶ 66, line 3	<u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to authenticate the alleged screenshot of Stardock's website, attached as Exhibit 13. <u>FRE 106</u> Furthermore, this isolated statement is only a portion of a larger text that the declarant should have included to provide necessary context.

1	2 Objectionable Evidence	3 Grounds for Objection
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	29. “Later in May 2018, Wardell conducted an informal survey or vote among potential purchasers of <i>Origins</i> of which aliens to include from <i>Star Control I and II</i> . At the end of the vote, he announced that several alien races from <i>Star Control I and II</i> will also be in <i>Origins</i> , and that they will play the same roles as in the original game . . .” Reiche Decl., p. 15, ¶ 70, lines 7-11	<u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 901</u> The declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, and has failed to provide the foundation required. <u>FRE 1002</u> Furthermore, the declarant has failed to include the documents required by the “best evidence” rule to demonstrate the accuracy of Wardell’s alleged comments and the results of the alleged survey. <u>FRE 106</u> Finally, this isolated statement is only a portion of a larger text that the declarant should have included to provide necessary context.
13 14 15 16 17	30. “In July 2018, Wardell confirmed that the Arilou will appear in <i>Origins</i> , and revealed that <i>Origins</i> will include other aliens from <i>Star Control I and II</i> called the Chenjesu and Melnorme.” Reiche Decl., p. 15, ¶ 71, lines 12-14	<u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement or to even indicate the source of this alleged statement.
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	31. “On August 13, 2018, Wardell stated that ‘Stardock owns the Star Control aliens. Paul and Fred *might* have copyrights to how those aliens were expressed in Star Control II but that’s the extent of it . . . Stardock will utilize the Star Control aliens as it sees fit.’ A screenshot of the UQM forum containing this post is attached hereto as Exhibit 14 Reiche Decl., p. 15, ¶ 72, lines 15-18	<u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement, or to authenticate the alleged screenshot of the UQM forum post, attached as Exhibit 14. <u>FRE 106</u> Furthermore, this isolated statement is only a portion of a larger text that the declarant should have included to provide necessary context.
25 26 27	32. “On August 14, 2018, Wardell admitted that ‘We expect players to assume that	<u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his

	Objectionable Evidence	Grounds for Objection
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<p>the Arilou species [in Star Control; Origins] is related to the Arilou species in SC2 [<i>Star Control II</i>].’ A screenshot of the UQM forum containing this post is attached hereto as Exhibit 15.”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 15, ¶ 73, lines 19-21</p>	<p>statement, or to authenticate the alleged screenshot of the UQM forum post, attached as Exhibit 15.</p> <p><u>FRE 106</u> Furthermore, this isolated statement is only a portion of a larger text that the declarant should have included to provide necessary context.</p>
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<p>33. “ . . . appearing to confirm our suspicion that Stardock will ultimately seek to stop us from using our own characters in our sequel. A screenshot of Stardock’s online forum containing this statement is attached as Exhibit 16.”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 15, ¶ 74, lines 24-27</p>	<p><u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement, or to authenticate the alleged screenshot of the UQM forum post, attached as Exhibit 16.</p> <p><u>Speculation</u> Furthermore, the declarant is speculating as to Stardock’s future intentions regarding its intellectual property.</p>
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	<p>34. “Stardock has also used on its website images of aliens that are substantially similar to and/or derived from aliens from <i>Star Control I and II</i>, e.g.: [Images of aliens allegedly from Star Control I and II and then current aliens allegedly from Stardock’s Website]</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 16, ¶ 75, lines 1-16</p>	<p><u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement, or to authenticate the alleged screenshot of aliens from Star Control I and II or from Stardock’s website.</p> <p><u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 701</u> Furthermore, the declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, as he does not have the expertise necessary to provide opinion as to whether aliens in Stardock are “substantially similar to and/or derived from aliens from <i>Star Control I and II</i>.” As a result, his opinions constitute improper lay witness testimony that encompasses technical and/or specialized knowledge exclusively within the scope</p>

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
	Objectionable Evidence	Grounds for Objection																								
		of FRE 702.																								
35.	“ . . . given all of the above, [<i>Origins</i>] seems likely to infringe our copyrights.” Reiche Decl., p. 16, ¶ 76, lines 17-20	<u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 701</u> Furthermore, the declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, as he does not have the expertise necessary to provide opinion as to whether <i>Origins</i> will infringe on any copyrights. As a result, his opinions constitute improper lay witness testimony that encompasses technical and/or specialized knowledge exclusively within the scope of FRE 702.																								
36.	“ . . . Stardock released two content packs consisting of names, images, and descriptions of characters in <i>Origins</i> that are substantially similar to and/or derived from characters from . . . <i>Star Control I and II</i> . . . ” Reiche Decl., p. 16, ¶ 77, lines 21-24	<u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement.																								

	Objectionable Evidence	Grounds for Objection
37.	<p>“. . . Wardell admitted that <i>Origins</i> includes characters called the Arilou who are from <i>Star Control I and II</i>. Besides the identical names, below is a comparison of images of the Arilou from <i>Star Control I and II</i> and from the <i>Origins</i> content pack:” [Images of aliens allegedly from Star Control I and II and then current aliens allegedly from <i>Origins</i>]</p> <p>Reiche Decl., ¶ 78, p. 16 lines 25-27 to p. 17 lines 1-22.</p>	<p><u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement, or to authenticate the alleged screenshot of aliens from Star Control I and II or from the <i>Origins</i> content pack.</p>
38.	<p>“Stardock’s website and content pack describe the Arilou in <i>Origins</i> as a ‘race of green-skinned aliens who admit to having been watching the human race for a long time,’ and as ‘little green men.’ Calling themselves the Arilou Lalee’lay, they have apparently been watching humanity for a long time . . . they also seem to be almost purposefully mysterious.’ Similarly, the Arilou are described in <i>Star Control II</i> as ‘[t]he Ariloulaleelay are a mysterious race . . . they do make regular, secret visits to your world, and have done so for centuries.’ The <i>Star Control II</i> manual further describes the Arilou as ‘pale, about 1.5 meters tall, and have large, childlike heads with dark, soulful eyes . . . The Arilou may have visited Earth often in the past . . .’</p> <p>Reiche Decl., ¶ 79, p. 17 lines 23-28 to p. 18 lines 1-2.</p>	<p><u>FRE 1002</u> The declarant has failed to include the documents required by the “best evidence” rule to demonstrate the accuracy of the alleged descriptions.</p>
39.	<p>“. . . Wardell admitted that <i>Origins</i> includes characters . . . from <i>Star Control I and II</i>. Besides the identical names, below is a comparison of images of the</p>	<p><u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement, or to authenticate the alleged</p>

1	2	3
4	5	6
	<p>Chenjesu from <i>Star Control</i> and from the <i>Origins</i> content pack:” [Images of Chenjesu allegedly from <i>Star Control I</i> and <i>II</i> and then from <i>Origins</i>]</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 18, ¶ 80, lines 4-27</p>	<p>Screenshot of aliens from <i>Star Control I</i> and <i>II</i> or from <i>Origins</i>.</p>
7	<p>40. “Stardock’s website and content pack describe the Chenjesu as ‘ambulatory crystals themselves, who fed on a unique mixture of solar and chemical processes. Peaceful and very intelligent’ and living on a ‘strange crystalline world . . .’</p> <p>Similarly, the Chenjesu were described in <i>Star Control</i> as ‘[c]rystalline in substance, existing on electric energy,’ and later described in <i>Star Control II</i> as having ‘fantastic intellects,’ and being ‘peaceful,’ and being ‘a photo/chemovore (it derives its nourishment from light and ambient minerals).’</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 19, ¶ 81, lines 1-7</p>	<p><u>FRE 1002</u></p> <p>The declarant has failed to include the documents required by the “best evidence” rule to demonstrate the accuracy of the alleged descriptions.</p>
8	<p>41. “In addition to the content packs, Stardock also released a beta version of <i>Origins</i> that . . . is substantially similar to and/or derived from the Super Melee part of <i>Star Control II</i> in terms of the layout, user interface, functionality, and user experience . . . Various customers who preordered <i>Origins</i> and had the opportunity to test another beta version of the game . . . have also posted videos of additional content that suggests the version of the game to be released on September 20 will be substantially similar to and/or derived from <i>Star Control II</i>. Below are pictures of material from <i>Star Control II</i> as compared to material from Fleet Battles beta and other materials from <i>Origins</i> that we found online.” [Images of materials allegedly</p>	<p><u>FRE 901</u></p> <p>The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement, or to authenticate the alleged screenshot of comparative material from <i>Star Control I</i> and <i>II</i> or from <i>Origins</i>. Furthermore, defendant has not identified any of the customers that supposedly posted videos of content indicating that <i>Origins</i> is similar to <i>Star Control I</i> and <i>II</i>, nor has the declarant identified the videos themselves that allegedly contain these materials.</p> <p><u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 701</u></p> <p>Furthermore, the declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, as he does not have the</p>

	Objectionable Evidence	Grounds for Objection
	<p>from Star Control I and II and then from <i>Origins</i>] Reiche Decl., ¶ 82, p. 19 lines 8-26 to p. 20 lines 1-28</p>	expertise necessary to provide opinion as to whether material in <i>Origins</i> is “substantially similar to and/or derived from . . . from <i>Star Control I and II</i> .” As a result, his opinions constitute improper lay witness testimony that encompasses technical and/or specialized knowledge exclusively within the scope of FRE 702
42.	<p>“Moreover, the <i>Origins</i> Fleet Battles beta includes a ship-creator tool that allows players to easily create ships from <i>Star Control I and II</i>, which they can then share and Stardock then offers and distributes to purchasers of the game . . .”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 21, ¶ 83, lines 1-3</p>	<u>FRE 901</u> The declarant has failed to provide the foundation required to support his statement.
43.	<p>“There are numerous examples of ships that look substantially similar to ships from <i>Star Control I and II</i>, and in some cases bear the exact same or a substantially similar name as well. Below are some examples:” [Images of ships allegedly from Star Control I and II and then from <i>Origins</i>]</p> <p>Reiche Decl., ¶ 84, p. 21 lines 10 – p. 26 line 25</p>	<u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 901</u> The declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, has failed to provide the foundation required, and to authenticate the alleged screenshot of comparative ships from Star Control I and II or from <i>Origins</i> .
44.	<p>“Given Fred’s and my ownership of the copyrights to <i>Star Control I and II</i>, and good faith belief that Stardock’s publishing of the aforementioned content infringes on our copyrights, we served DMCA notices on two of the service providers through which Stardock has been selling and distributing this content.”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., ¶ 85, p. 26 line 26 - p. 27 line 1</p>	<u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 701</u> Furthermore, the declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, as he does not have the expertise necessary to provide opinion as to whether publishing the material would infringe any alleged copyrights. As a result, his opinions constitute improper lay witness testimony that encompasses technical and/or specialized knowledge exclusively within the scope of FRE 702.

	Objectionable Evidence	Grounds for Objection
45.	<p>“I did recently see a video posted last week by someone who has had the opportunity to test and review some version of the game who said that ‘I was impressed by how well <i>Origins</i> kept the original feel and style of the classic Star Control games of the 90s’ and that it ‘reminded me a lot of playing Star Control II.’ The video can be viewed here: https://youtu.be/umeaSgfmkVI”</p> <p>Reiche Decl., p. 27, ¶ 87, lines 10-14</p>	<p><u>FRE 602</u> <u>FRE 901</u> The declarant lacks the personal knowledge necessary to make this statement, has failed to provide the foundation required, and to authenticate the alleged video at the provided link.</p> <p><u>FRE 801, 802</u> Furthermore, the statements allegedly made by the unknown individual are being offered for their truth, and as such they are inadmissible hearsay without exception.</p>

11 Dated: September 21, 2018

12 Respectfully submitted,

13 **NIXON PEABODY LLP**

14 By: /s/ Robert A. Weikert

15 Robert A. Weikert (Bar No. 121146)

16 rweikert@nixonpeabody.com

17 Dawn N. Valentine (Bar No. 206486)

18 dvalentine@nixonpeabody.com

19 NIXON PEABODY LLP

20 One Embarcadero Center

21 San Francisco, California 94111-3600

22 Tel: (415) 984-8200

23 Fax: (415) 984-8300

24 David L. May (appearance *pro hac vice*)

25 dmay@nixonpeabody.com

26 Jennette E. Wiser (appearance *pro hac vice*)

27 jwiser@nixonpeabody.com

28 NIXON PEABODY LLP

29 799 9th Street NW

30 Washington, DC 20001-4501

31 Tel: (202) 585-8000

32 Fax: (202) 585-8080

1 Jason T. Kunze (appearance *pro hac vice*)
2 jkunze@nixonpeabody.com
3 NIXON PEABODY LLP
4 70 West Madison Street, 35th Floor
Chicago, IL 60602
Tel: (312) 977-4400
Fax: (312) 977-4405

5 *Attorneys for Stardock Systems, Inc.*

27 - 20 -

28 EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS TO THE DECLARATION OF REICHE ISO DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO
STARDOCK'S MOTION FOR TRO AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY PI SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED

Case No. 17-cv-07025-SBA